

September 6, 2016, PB&R Agenda Comments

Comments on Newport Beach Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission agenda submitted by:
Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

Item VI.A. Minutes of the August 2, 2016 PB&R Commission Meeting

The following corrections are suggested:

Page 1, Item III: “Supervisor Clemente provided a brief presentation on the Natural Resources ~~Divisions~~ Division’s involvement at the Annual Water Festival.”

Page 2, last paragraph: “~~Brendan~~ Brendon Blincoe commented on the debris created by the tree, ...”

Page 3, paragraph 3 from end: “Jim Mosher commented that the City G-1 Policy needs additional work ~~and that the City’s current policy was one of reforestation.~~” [As drafted, the deleted part adds nothing I can understand. I suspect I said I thought G-1 needs work, particularly as regards the City’s reforestation policy, but I don’t recall my exact words.]

Page 4, paragraph 4 from end: “He warned that this removal would be a loss of iconic trees and would set ~~precedence~~ precedent.”

Page 4, paragraph 3 from end: “Director Pisani said it was City code for the three car garage, but was also part of the Coastal Commission’s approval.”

Note: The request for a Coastal Development Permit was heard as Item 13b at the Coastal Commission’s January 16, 2016, meeting. Both the [staff report](#) and a [video](#) of the hearing are available in their online meeting archive. As indicated elsewhere in the draft minutes, the requirement for a three car garage appears to be a City requirement based on the large size of the house (see page 6). The primary Coastal Act issue was the bluff face development. Although the CCC staff report mentions that the plans include a three car garage, it repeatedly mentions that on-site parking for just two cars would be adequate to meet Commission requirements. The facts that completion of the project would require removal of City street trees and loss of an existing on-street public parking space do not appear to have been mentioned or discussed.

Page 4, paragraph 2 from end: “Discussion ensued regarding removal and storage of the trees, in particular if they could be removed, stored, and then replanted after construction on the same property.” [?]

Page 4, last paragraph: “Chair Marston confirmed the trees could not be relocated because of utility and ~~bio-retention~~ bioretention conflicts.”

Page 5, paragraph 2 (of comments): “He called the ~~bio-retention~~ bioretention area a “red herring” and requested the trees be preserved and replanted after construction.”

Page 5, paragraph 3: “Discussion ensued regarding the ~~bio-retention~~ bioretention and alternative BMP devices.”

Page 5, end of paragraph 7: “He asked that the trees ~~to~~ stay on Carnation and noted their importance in traffic calming. He also voiced his concern about the loss of a parking spot on Carnation due to the increased size of the proposed three car garage.”

Page 5, last paragraph: “*Bob Cortel expressed his love of the trees and that ~~that~~ Plan B would be detrimental to his property and views.*”

Page 6, last paragraph: “*He noted that there is a proposal going to City Council for a bench donation with a sculpture and wondered why the ~~Art Commission~~ Arts Commission's recommendation did not go through the PB&R Commission ~~prior~~.*”

Item VII.B. Newport Beach Sustainability Plan

PB&R interacts extensively not just with Recreation and Senior Services, but also with the Municipal Operations Department. Does MOD have any comments on this, in areas like park and beach maintenance and sustainability (water and energy conservation, etc.)?

Item VII.C. Continuation: Follow-up - Removal of Two Washingtonia Robusta (Mexican Fan Palm) Trees - 239 Carnation Avenue

See note under “Page 4, paragraph 3 from end” on previous page.

It might also be noted that in addition to tandem parking, vehicle lifts (allowing stacking) have been used in some areas to allow the parking of more cars with minimal impact on driveway width.

Item VII.D. Reforestation Request - 2845 Cassia Street

The letter from the property manager on behalf of the Eastbluff Homeowners Community Association Board (on the page in the staff report following the aerial photo of the site) does not appear to include “**a resolution** of the Board of Directors formally requesting a reforestation **with a statement** that all members of the community association having their residential views affected have been officially notified and given an appropriate opportunity to respond before the Board voted on the request” as required on [page 9](#) of City Council [Policy G-1](#).